

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, in light of the following discussion, is respectfully requested. After entry of the foregoing amendment, Claims 1-14 remain pending in the present application. No new matter has been added.¹

By way of summary, the Office Action presented the following issues: Claims 1-12 and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over U.S. Patent App. Publ'n No. 2001/0035854 to Rosenberg et al. (hereinafter "Rosenberg") in view of U.S. Patent App. Publ'n No. 2005/0007342 to Cruz-Hernandez et al. (hereinafter "Cruz-Hernandez"); and Claim 13 was indicated as allowable if rewritten in independent form.

Applicants thank Examiner Davis for the indication of allowable subject matter. Accordingly, Applicants have rewritten allowable Claim 13 in independent form.

Claims 1-12 and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Rosenberg in view of Cruz-Hernandez. In light of that rejection, independent Claims 1, 5, and 9 have been amended to clarify the claimed inventions and to thereby more clearly patentably define over the applied references.

Amended Claim 1 is directed to a haptic function-provided input device including, in part,

an input detection unit, which has [an] input detection plane, that detects a touching position of an operation body and a sliding speed of the operation body;

a computation unit . . . ; and

a vibration unit that vibrates the input detection plane . . . , wherein the computation unit is configured to determine an operation case to compute [a] vibration pattern, based on a ratio of the sliding speed of the operation body to a shift in an excitation timing between two actuators of the vibration unit.

Rosenberg and Cruz-Hernandez do not disclose or suggest those features.

¹ The amendments to independent Claims 1, 5, and 9 find support at least in Fig. 14 and in its accompanying text in the specification.

The Office Action acknowledged, “Rosenberg fails to explicitly teach [that] the computation unit is configured to compute the vibration pattern further based on a shift in an excitation timing between two actuators of the vibration unit.”² To remedy that deficiency, the Office Action relied on Cruz-Hernandez.

Cruz-Hernandez concerns an electro-mechanical transducer “configured to selectively operate in one of multiple possible operational modes at a given time.”³ According to Cruz-Hernandez, “ The operational mode of the electro-mechanical transducer 120 at a given time will depend, for example, on the characteristics of the drive signal received from [a] driver 10.”⁴

Cruz-Hernandez is silent regarding how the operational mode depends on the characteristics of the drive signal. Cruz-Hernandez does not disclose or suggest that “the computation unit is configured to determine an operation case . . . , based on a ratio of the sliding speed of the operation body to a shift in an excitation timing between two actuators of the vibration unit,” as recited in amended Claim 1.

Thus, no proper combination of Rosenberg and Cruz-Hernandez discloses or suggests that “the computation unit is configured to determine an operation case . . . , based on a ratio of the sliding speed of the operation body to a shift in an excitation timing between two actuators of the vibration unit,” as recited in amended Claim 1.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Claim 1 and all associated dependent claims patentably distinguish over any proper combination of Rosenberg and Cruz-Hernandez.

For at least analogous reasons, independent Claims 5 and 9 and all associated dependent claims also distinguish over any proper combination of Rosenberg and Cruz-Hernandez.

² Office Action at 4.

³ Cruz-Hernandez, para. [0026].

⁴ Id.

Consequently, in view of the present amendment and in light of the foregoing comments, it is respectfully submitted the present application patentably distinguishes over the applied references. The application is therefore in condition for allowance, and an early and favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, L.L.P.



Bradley D. Lytle
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 40,073

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 07/09)

Brian R. Epstein
Registration No. 60,329